DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 716 CE 018 616

AUTHOR Hinrichs, Roy S.
TITLE Evaluation of Curriculum Materials Disseminated to Mississippi Industrial Arts Teachers during the 1976-77 School Year. Research Report. Industrial Arts Series, Publication Number 10,013.
INSTITUTION Mississippi Research and Curriculum Unit for Vocational and Technical Education, State College.
SPONS AGENCY Mississippi State Dept. of Education, Jackson. Div. of Vocational and Technical Education.
PUB DATE Sep 77
NOTE 33p.; Appendix may be marginally legible

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Content Analysis; *Curriculum Evaluation; *Industrial Arts Teachers; *Industrial Education; Information Dissemination; *Instructional Materials; Junior High Schools; Program Effectiveness; Questionnaires; Secondary Education; Teacher Attitudes; Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS *Mississippi

ABSTRACT

An evaluation of curriculum materials (four publications) disseminated to Mississippi industrial arts teachers during the 1976-77 school year was conducted. Four questionnaires were prepared and mailed to all of the state's 242 industrial arts teachers. The objectives of the evaluation were to determine the following: (1) number of teachers using the materials in their programs; (2) amount of usage of the materials in terms of hours of instruction taught; (3) amount of usage of the materials in terms of number of students taught; (4) overall quality of the materials as rated on thirteen specific items; and (5) the extent that dissemination programs influence the use of Mississippi State University Research and Curriculum Unit materials. Based upon the findings, the following conclusions were drawn: (a) three out of four industrial arts teachers were using the materials in their programs; (b) the average number of hours taught per class with the materials was close to the suggested time for each publication; (c) a total of 9,708 students received instruction in industrial arts programs as a result of the materials; (d) in the opinion of the teachers, the overall quality of the material is high; and (e) the chances are greater that teachers who are presented the materials through dissemination programs will use the publication in their classes as compared to those who just receive the publications in the mail. (JH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED167716

RESEARCH REPORT

EVALUATION OF CURRICULUM MATERIALS DISSEMINATED TO MISSISSIPPI INDUSTRIAL ARTS TEACHERS DURING THE 1976-77 SCHOOL YEAR

by

Roy S. Hinrichs
Associate Professor
Mississippi State University

Sponsored by the:

Division of Vocational and Technical Education
Mississippi State Department of Education
Jackson, Mississippi

Published by the:

Mississippi State University
Research and Curriculum Unit
for
Vocational/Technical Education
Mississippi State, Mississippi

Industrial Arts Series
Publication Number 10,013

September 1977

CE 018 616

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. S. Hinrichs

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

Direct Inquiries to:

Research and Curriculum Unit for
Vocational-Technical Education
Drawer DX
Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762

Mississippi State University does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or handicap.

PREFACE

Dissemination is considered a vital part of the curriculum development process in the Research and Curriculum Unit at Mississippi State University. Mailing instructional materials to teachers is no assurance that they will be used correctly, or even used at all. It is strongly believed that the material must be taken to teachers where it can be explained in detail. As it is impossible to do this on an individual basis, the dissemination in-service program allows many teachers to meet together with the curriculum developer to accomplish this purpose.

The participants complete an instrument at the close of these dissemination meetings to evaluate the program and the material presented. It could be argued, however, that a true evaluation of any program designed to disseminate curriculum material can only be done at a later date. The true test is whether or not the teachers have actually incorporated the materials into their on-going programs.

Curriculum materials, likewise, are very difficult to evaluate without thorough study. Often, it is only after teachers are using the material with students that they fully realize the strengths and weaknesses of the material.

This study was conducted six months after the dissemination programs. It is felt that teachers have had sufficient time with the material to decide whether or not they intend to make use of it; and to form judgment on its value.

Data for the study were secured from questionnaires. The data were transferred to code sheets and analyzed by the Computer Center at Mississippi State University.

Special thanks are extended to the industrial arts teachers who took the time to complete and return the questionnaires. These teachers made this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE iii

INTRODUCTION 1

OBJECTIVES 1

EXPLANATION OF REPORTING PROCEDURE 2

ELECTRICITY-ELECTRONICS FOR INDUSTRIAL ARTS

Presentation of Data 3
Analysis of Data 5

IMPROVING MEASURING SKILLS (REVISED EDITION)

Presentation of Data 7
Analysis of Data 9

RESOURCE INFORMATION FOR INDUSTRIAL ARTS

Presentation of Data 10
Analysis of Data 12

FUNDAMENTALS OF CERAMICS

Presentation of Data 13
Analysis of Data 15

EVALUATION OF DISSEMINATION PROGRAMS

Presentation of Data 16
Analysis of Data 18

CONCLUSION 20

APPENDIX

Letter of Transmittal 23
Sample Questionnaire 24

INTRODUCTION

Five regional inservice programs were held for industrial arts teachers between October 25, 1976 and November 10, 1976. The purpose of these programs was to disseminate curriculum materials developed at the Research and Curriculum Unit at Mississippi State University. Curriculum materials disseminated consisted of the following publications:

1. Hinrichs, Roy S. Electricity-Electronics for Industrial Arts. Research and Curriculum Unit for Vocational-Technical Education, Mississippi State University, 1976, 103 pp.
2. Hinrichs, Roy S. Improving Measuring Skills (Revised Edition). Research and Curriculum Unit for Vocational-Technical Education, Mississippi State University, 1976, 93 pp.
3. Hinrichs, Roy S. and Stone, Gary A. Resource Information for Industrial Arts. Research and Curriculum Unit for Vocational-Technical Education, Mississippi State University, 1976, 37 pp.
4. Stone, Gary A. Fundamentals of Ceramics. Research and Curriculum Unit for Vocational-Technical Education, Mississippi State University, 1976, 159 pp.

In April 1977, four questionnaires were prepared and mailed to all of the state's 242 industrial arts teachers. (See Appendix.) The teachers were asked to evaluate the materials listed above by completing the questionnaires and returning them in the enclosed stamped, addressed envelope. The questionnaires attempted to determine the teachers' opinions concerning the overall quality of the materials and the amount of usage of the publications.

OBJECTIVES

The specific objectives for the evaluation of the curriculum materials were to determine the:

1. Number of teachers using the materials in their programs.

2. Amount of usage of the materials in terms of hours of instruction taught.

3. Amount of usage of the materials in terms of numbers of students taught.

4. Overall quality of the materials as rated on 13 specific items.

5. Extent that dissemination programs influence the use of Research and Curriculum Unit materials.

EXPLANATION OF REPORTING PROCEDURE

The following pages contain the evaluation for the curriculum materials and the dissemination programs. For clarity, the presentation of data and the analysis of data for each separate publication are presented together under the title of the publication. In a like manner, both the presentation of data and the analysis of data for the evaluation of the dissemination programs are presented together under the heading EVALUATION OF DISSEMINATION PROGRAMS.

The conclusions presented are comprehensive in that they pertain to the four publications and to the dissemination programs.

Appendix materials contain a letter of transmittal and a sample questionnaire. The same questionnaire was used to obtain information concerning each of the four publications. The questionnaires, however, were printed on four different colors of paper to correspond to the number of publications under evaluation. The title of each publication was typed in the upper left corner of each questionnaire.

Evaluation of

ELECTRICITY-ELECTRONICS FOR INDUSTRIAL ARTS

Presentation of Data

Total responses (N): 86

Number of teachers using the publication: 31

Number of teachers not using the publication: 55

Reasons given for not using the publication:

1) Subject matter not related to teacher's program: 17
2) Not interested: 1
3) Material too complicated: 3
4) Not enough copies: 5
5) Other materials more appropriate: 6
6) Plan to use later: 28

Data presented in Table 1 pertains to the teachers' use of the material. Data presented in Table 2 indicates teachers' evaluation of the overall quality of the material.

Table 1

Grade Level	No. of Programs using Material	No. of Hours Taught	No. of Students Taught	Average No. of Hours Taught	Average No. of Students per Teacher*
7th	8	169	267	21.1	33.8
8th	16	308	744	19.2	46.5
9th	17	382	739	22.5	43.5
10th	9	265	281	29.4	31.2
11th	4	120	96	30.0	24.0
12th	4	128	53	32.0	13.3
Totals:	58	1372	2180		

*Many teachers have two classes of the same grade.

Table 2

Responses of Teachers Concerning Overall Quality of ELECTRICITY-ELECTRONICS FOR INDUSTRIAL ARTS

Topics	5 Excellent	4 Good	3 Fair	2 Poor	1 Unaccept-able	Means
Overall usefulness to my program	16	12	1	0	0	4.52
Practicality of content	10	18	1	0	0	4.32
General organization of content	17	9	2	0	0	4.54
Clearness and conciseness	11	15	2	1	0	4.24
Degree of technicality	11	15	1	2	0	4.21
Degree of complexity	7	17	4	1	0	4.03
Accuracy	14	12	1	1	0	4.40
Adaptability	10	18	1	0	0	4.31
Appropriateness of reading level	7	18	3	1	0	4.07
Photographs and figures	15	13	1	0	0	4.48
Type size and style	19	9	0	0	0	4.70
Durability of binding	13	13	2	1	0	4.31
Neatness and general printing quality	21	8	0	0	0	4.72

Analysis of Data

A total of 86 industrial arts teachers responded to the questionnaire. Of this number, 31 reported using the publication in 58 classes for a total of 1,372 hours of instruction to 2,180 students. Twenty-eight of the 55 teachers not using the publication indicated that they plan to do so in the future.

Responses by the teachers concerning the overall quality of the publication were very favorable. The grand mean for the 13 specific factors evaluated by the teachers was 4.37 on the five point scale used on the questionnaire.

The publication was intended to be used in the multi-field industrial arts programs usually found in the eighth or ninth grade level. Thirty-three of the 58 classes (56.90 percent) in which the material was reported being used were eighth and ninth grades. The remaining 25 classes (43.10 percent) were scattered among the seventh, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade levels.

The material included in the publication was designed to be used over a time span of eight weeks, or 40 hours of instruction. The grand mean for the number of hours or instruction in which the material was reported being used, however, was only 25.7 hours.

The material was not disseminated until late October or early November. It can, therefore, be assumed that many industrial arts teachers had their programs already planned and could not incorporate the material into their classes during the 1976-77 school year. This assumption makes the number of teachers who reported they "plan to use the material in the future" very important. Twenty-eight teachers indicated they plan to use

the material in the future. This group, plus the 31 teachers who reported using the material, brought the total number of teachers who have used, or will use, the material to 59. This figure represents 67 percent of the teachers responding to the questionnaire.

Evaluation of

IMPROVING MEASURING SKILLS (REVISED EDITION)

Presentation of Data

Total responses (N): 87

Number of teachers using the publication: 66

Number of teachers not using the publication: 21

Reasons given for not using the publication:

1) Subject matter not related to teacher's program: 1
2) Not interested: 2
3) Material too complicated: 1
4) Not enough copies: 1
5) Other materials more appropriate: 2
6) Plan to use later: 19

Data presented in Table 3 pertains to the teacher's use of the material. Data presented in Table 4 indicates teachers' evaluation of the overall quality of the material.

Table 3

Grade Level	No. of Programs using Material	No. of Hours Taught	No. of Students Taught	Average No. of Hours Taught	Average No. of Students per Teacher*
7th	19	271	785	14.3	41.3
8th	41	591	1655	14.4	40.4
9th	30	317	1217	10.6	40.6
10th	15	276	390	18.4	26.0
11th	7	95	140	13.6	20.0
12th	8	99	93	12.4	11.6
Totals:	120	1649	4280		

*Many teachers have two classes of the same grade.

Table 4

Responses of Teachers Concerning Overall Quality of IMPROVING MEASURING SKILLS (REVISED EDITION)

Topics	5 Excellent	4 Good	3 Fair	2 Poor	1 Unacceptable	Means
Overall usefulness to my program	33	28	4	0	0	4.45
Practicality of content	34	25	5	0	0	4.45
General organization of content	36	21	7	0	1	4.40
Clearness and conciseness	35	24	2	4	0	4.37
Degree of technicality	0	32	13	2	0	4.02
Degree of complexity	14	30	19	2	0	3.86
Accuracy	29	28	6	2	0	4.29
Adaptability	26	34	4	0	0	4.34
Appropriateness of reading level	30	30	4	0	0	4.41
Photographs and figures	34	28	3	0	0	4.48
Type size and style	37	26	2	0	0	4.54
Durability of binding	26	27	6	4	0	4.19
Neatness and general printing quality	45	18	1	0	0	4.69

Analysis of Data

A total of 87 industrial arts teachers responded to the questionnaire. Of this number, 66 reported using the publication in 120 classes for a total of 1,649 hours of instruction to 4,280 students. Nineteen of the 21 teachers not using the publication indicated they plan to do so in the future.

Responses by the teachers concerning the overall quality of the publication were very favorable. The grand mean for the 13 specific factors evaluated by the teachers was 4.35 on the five point scale used on the questionnaire.

The material included in the publication is remedial in nature; designed to help students overcome their inability to measure correctly. Of the 4,280 students reported being taught with the material, 3,657 (85 percent) were enrolled in the seventh, eighth, or ninth grades. These are the grade levels at which students would first elect to take industrial arts.

As previously mentioned, the material was disseminated after the start of the school year. Adding, therefore, the 19 teachers who plan to use the material later with the 66 teachers who reported using the material, brought the total to 85 teachers. This figure of 85 teachers who use, or will use, the material represents 98 percent of those teachers responding to the questionnaire.

Evaluation of

RESOURCE INFORMATION FOR INDUSTRIAL ARTS

Presentation of Data

Total responses (N): 83

Number of teachers using the publication: 35

Number of teachers not using the publication: 48

Reasons given for not using the publication:

1) Subject matter not related to teacher's program: 8
2) Not interested: 4
3) Material too complicated: 3
4) Not enough copies: 5
5) Other materials more appropriate: 3
6) Plan to use later: 32

Data presented in Table 5 pertains to the teachers' use of the material. Data presented in Table 6 indicates teachers' evaluation of the overall quality of the material.

Table 5

Grade Level	No. of Programs using Material	No. of Hours Taught	No. of Students Taught	Average No. of Hours Taught	Average No. of Students per Teacher*
7th	8	127	415	15.9	51.9
8th	22	231	1006	10.5	45.7
9th	17	204	605	12.0	35.6
10th	5	88	103	17.6	20.6
11th	3	53	65	17.7	21.7
12th	3	54	70	18.0	23.3
Totals:	58	757	2264		

*Many teachers have two classes of the same grade.

Table 6

Responses of Teachers Concerning Overall Quality of RESOURCE INFORMATION FOR INDUSTRIAL ARTS

Topics	5 Excellent	4 Good	3 Fair	2 Poor	1 Unacceptable	Means
Overall usefulness to my program	17	16	1	0	0	4.47
Practicality of content	14	19	1	0	0	4.38
General organization of content	20	11	3	0	0	4.50
Clearness and conciseness	16	14	3	1	0	4.32
Degree of technicality	13	16	3	1	0	4.24
Degree of complexity	8	15	8	2	0	3.88
Accuracy	14	15	3	2	0	4.21
Adaptability	16	14	3	0	0	4.39
Appropriateness of reading level	12	17	4	0	0	4.24
Photographs and figures	14	13	4	0	0	4.32
Type size and style	19	14	1	0	0	4.53
Durability of binding	16	15	2	1	0	4.35
Neatness and general printing quality	20	14	0	0	0	4.54

Analysis of Data

A total of 83 industrial arts teachers responded to the questionnaire. Of this number, 35 reported using the publication in 58 classes for a total of 757 hours of instruction to 2,264 students. Thirty-two of the 48 teachers not using the publication indicated they plan to do so in the future.

Responses by the teachers concerning the overall quality of the publication were very favorable. The grand mean for the 13 specific factors evaluated by the teachers was 4.34 on the five point scale used on the questionnaire.

Of the 2,264 students who were provided instruction as a result of this material, 1,611 (71.1 percent) were in the eighth and ninth grades. This figure is in proportion to the total breakdown of all industrial arts students in grades seven through twelve.

The average number of hours of instruction reported ranged from a high of 18 hours for twelfth grade students, to a low of 10.5 hours for eighth grade students. These figures are in line with the recommended usage of the material, which was 10 to 15 hours.

Thirty-two of the teachers not using the material reported they plan to do so in the future. When added to the 35 teachers who reported using the material, the total was 67 teachers. This figure of 67 teachers who use, or will use, the material represents 80.7 percent of those teachers responding to the questionnaire.

Evaluation of

FUNDAMENTALS OF CERAMICS

Presentation of Data

Total responses (N): 85

Number of teachers using the publication: 22

Number of teachers not using the publication: 63

Reasons given for not using the publication:

1) Subject matter not related to teacher's program: 35
2) Not interested: 7
3) Material too complicated: 1
4) Not enough copies: 3
5) Other materials more appropriate: 5
6) Plan to use later: 15

Data presented in Table 7 pertains to the teachers' use of the material. Data presented in Table 8 indicates teachers' evaluation of the overall quality of the material.

Table 7

Grade Level	No. of Programs using Material	No. of Hours Taught	No. of Students Taught	Average No. of Hours Taught	Average No. of Students per Teacher*
7th	7	135	282	19.3	40.3
8th	13	239	214	18.4	16.5
9th	7	89	417	12.7	59.6
10th	2	75	56	37.5	28.0
11th	1	50	25	50.0	25.0
12th	1	50	10	50.0	10.0
Totals:	31	638	1004		

*Many teachers have two classes of the same grade.

Table 8

Responses of Teachers Concerning Overall Quality of FUNDAMENTALS OF CERAMICS

Topics	5 Excellent	4 Good	3 Fair	2 Poor	1 Unacceptable	Means
Overall usefulness to my program	10	10	0	0	0	4.50
Practicality of content	7	11	2	0	0	4.25
General organization of content	11	7	2	0	0	4.50
Clearness and conciseness	6	11	2	1	0	4.10
Degree of technicality	5	14	0	1	0	4.15
Degree of complexity	4	11	5	0	0	3.90
Accuracy	10	9	1	0	0	4.40
Adaptability	8	11	1	0	0	4.35
Appropriateness of reading level	6	11	1	2	0	4.05
Photographs and figures	7	11	2	0	0	4.25
Type size and style	8	9	3	0	0	4.25
Durability of binding	10	9	0	1	0	4.40
Neatness and general printing quality	14	5	1	0	0	4.65

Analysis of Data

A total of 85 industrial arts teachers responded to the questionnaire. Of this number, 22 reported using the publication in 31 classes for a total of 638 hours of instruction to 1,004 students. Fifteen of the 63 teachers not using the publication indicated they plan to do so in the future.

Responses by the teachers concerning the overall quality of the publication were very favorable. The grand mean for the 13 specific factors evaluated by the teachers was 4.29 on the five point scale used on the questionnaire.

The material was considered most appropriate for the seventh grade where ceramics is part of the Industrial Crafts program. However, only 282 students (28.1 percent) of the 1,004 students reported being taught were in that grade. The largest number of students taught, 417 (41.5 percent), were in the ninth grade.

Fifteen of the teachers not using the material reported they plan to do so in the future. When added to the 22 teachers who reported using the material, the total was 37 teachers. This figure of 37 teachers who use, or will use, the material represents 43.5 percent of those teachers responding to the questionnaire.

EVALUATION OF DISSEMINATION PROGRAMS

Presentation of Data

The purposes of the inservice programs was to disseminate curriculum materials developed at the Research and Curriculum Unit. At the programs, the new materials were carefully explained to the industrial arts teachers in attendance. This included: (1) the rationale and an introduction to the material; (2) a transparency presentation of the material content; (3) explanation and demonstration of teaching strategies; (4) suggestions for implementation into on-going programs; and (5) a question and answer session.

A total of 137 teachers attended the in-service dissemination programs. This figure represents 51.31 percent of the state's 267 industrial arts teachers. One copy of each of the curriculum materials was mailed to all industrial arts teachers unable to attend one of the in-service programs.

In an attempt to determine the extent to which the program may have influenced teachers to use the material, a question was included on the questionnaire in which the teachers were asked to check whether or not they had attended one of the in-service programs.

The data in Table 9 reflects the number and percent of teachers using the curriculum materials. The number and percent of teachers who plan to use the curriculum materials is presented in Table 10.

Table 9

Number and Percentage of Teachers Using the Curriculum Materials

Title of Publication	No. of Returns	No. and % using Material	No. and % using Material who attended Program	No. and % using Material who did not attend Program
Electricity-Electronics for Industrial Arts	86	31 36.05	24 77.42	7 22.58
Improving Measuring Skills (Revised Edition)	87	66 75.86	55 83.33	11 16.67
Resource Information for Industrial Arts	83	35 42.17	29 82.86	6 17.14
Fundamentals of Ceramics	85	22 25.88	16 72.73	6 27.27

Table 10

Number and Percentage of Teachers Who Plan To Use the Curriculum Material

Title of Publication	No. of Returns	No. and % Planning to use Material	No. and % Planning to use Material who attended Program	No. and % Who Plan to use Material and did not attend Program
Electricity-Electronics for Industrial Arts	86	28 32.56	19 67.86	9 32.14
Improving Measuring Skills (Revised Edition)	87	19 21.84	13 68.42	6 31.58
Resource Information for Industrial Arts	83	32 38.55	29 90.63	3 9.38
Fundamentals of Ceramics	85	15 17.65	7 46.67	8 53.33

Analysis of Data

Analysis of the data presented in Table 9 indicates the effectiveness of the dissemination programs in terms of teachers using the materials. More than three times as many teachers who attended the dissemination program used the ELECTRICITY-ELECTRONICS FOR INDUSTRIAL ARTS publication, as compared to the number found using the material who did not attend the program. For the IMPROVING MEASURING SKILLS publication, five times as many users had attended the program. For the RESOURCE INFORMATION FOR INDUSTRIAL ARTS publication, almost five times as many users had attended the program as compared to the users who did not attend. The publication, FUNDAMENTALS OF CERAMICS, was intended for teachers of seventh grade students and, therefore, many teachers of other grade levels would not use the material in their programs. However, almost three times as many teachers found using the material had attended one of the programs as compared to teachers found using the material who did not attend.

As has been mentioned, the dissemination programs were held in October and November, and, therefore, it was assumed that many teachers had their programs already planned for the entire school year. This makes the number of teachers who indicated they plan to use the material later very important in the evaluation of the dissemination programs.

The data presented in Table 10 depicts the number of teachers who plan to use the material later. For two publications, ELECTRICITY-ELECTRONICS FOR INDUSTRIAL ARTS and IMPROVING MEASURING SKILLS, more than twice the number of teachers who plan to use the material had attended the program as compared to those teachers who plan to use the material

CONCLUSION

This study attempted to evaluate the curriculum materials disseminated to industrial arts teachers for use in their instructional programs. The study also attempted to determine the effectiveness of the dissemination process by which these materials were presented and explained to the teachers.

To the extent that the responses from teachers whose returned questionnaires are typical of all industrial arts teachers, the following conclusions are presented:

1. Industrial arts teachers are using the material in their programs. Three out of every four teachers are using the materials or plan to do so in the future. (Percentage based on the mean percentile for the four publications.)
2. It appears that industrial arts teachers are using the materials in their classes as recommended. The average number of hours taught per class is close to the time suggested for each publication.
3. A total of 9,708 students received instructions in industrial arts programs as a direct result of the instructional materials.
4. In the opinion of the teachers, the overall quality of the material was high. The grand mean of the thirteen items on which each publication was rated was 4.34 on the five point scale used on the questionnaire. This was between the Excellent and Good categories.
5. Some teachers who did not attend one of the dissemination programs had used the materials. Still other teachers who did not attend plan to use the materials later. The data indicates, however, that the chances are three and a half times greater that teachers who

are presented the curriculum materials through dissemination programs will use the publications in their classes as compared to those who just receive the publications through the mail. With these statistics in mind, it would appear that if material from the Research and Curriculum Unit is to make an impact on vocational education, plans must be made to conduct dissemination programs for all new materials.

APPENDIX

MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

RESEARCH AND CURRICULUM UNIT FOR
VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION
P. O. DRAWER DX
MISSISSIPPI STATE, MISSISSIPPI 39762
PHONE: 601 325-2510

April 27, 1977

TO: Mississippi Industrial Arts Teachers

FROM: Roy S. Hinrichs, Curriculum Coordinator, R/CU

SUBJECT: Evaluation of R/CU Publications

We are attempting to evaluate instructional materials which have been developed at the Research and Curriculum Unit at Mississippi State University. We need your help. Your responses will enable us to determine the worth of the materials disseminated last year and also give some indications as to how future materials can be improved to be more helpful to you and your industrial arts program.

Included are four evaluation forms, one for each of the publications disseminated at the October/November inservice programs; or sent by mail if you did not attend one of the programs. The title of the publication to be evaluated appears at the top left side of each form. Please complete each form and return to the R/CU in the enclosed stamped envelope. The data will be treated confidentially and will only appear in tabular form.

I realize this is a busy time of the year, with school about to close for the summer. Again, however, we need your help, so please take ten or fifteen minutes to complete the evaluation forms and mail them to the R/CU.

Thank you.

Encls.

Evaluation of R/CU Publication Entitled:

_____

13-14 1. Have you used this publication in your program? ( ) Yes ( ) No

If you answered Question 1 "Yes", complete Questions 3-5 on this questionnaire. If you answered Question 1 "No", complete only Questions 2 and 3.

2. If you did not use this publication in your program, check the appropriate reason(s) listed below:

15 ( ) a. Subject matter is not related to my program.

17 ( ) b. No interest in teaching this subject matter.

18 ( ) c. Subject matter is too complicated.

19 ( ) d. Not enough copies.

20 ( ) e. Other teaching materials more appropriate.

21 ( ) f. Plan to use the materials later.

22 ( ) g. Other. Please list other reasons why you have not used this publication in your program.

24-25 3. Did you attend the inservice program at which this material was explained? ( ) Yes ( ) No

4. If you have used this publication, indicate the appropriate group(s) with whom it was used. Also indicate the approximate number of hours each group was taught and the approximate size of each group this year.

27	( ) 7th grade students	____ (28-29) hours	____ (30-31) students
32	( ) 8th grade students	____ (33-34) hours	____ (35-36) students
37	( ) 9th grade students	____ (38-39) hours	____ (40-41) students
42	( ) 10th grade students	____ (43-44) hours	____ (45-46) students
47	( ) 11th grade students	____ (48-49) hours	____ (50-51) students
52	( ) 12th grade students	____ (53-54) hours	____ (55-56) students
57	( ) Post-secondary students	____ (58-59) hours	____ (60-61) students
62	( ) Adult students	____ (63-64) hours	____ (65-66) students

32

5. Using the scale shown below, indicate the quality of the materials in relation to the specific topics listed below. Circle the appropriate number.

Scale:
5 - Excellent
4 - Good
3 - Fair
2 - Poor
1 - Unacceptable

Topics:

68	Overall usefulness to my program	5	4	3	2	1
69	Practicality of content	5	4	3	2	1
70	General organization of content	5	4	3	2	1
71	Clearness and conciseness	5	4	3	2	1
72	Degree of technicality	5	4	3	2	1
73	Degree of complexity	5	4	3	2	1
74	Accuracy	5	4	3	2	1
75	Adaptability	5	4	3	2	1
76	Appropriateness of reading level	5	4	3	2	1
77	Photographs and figures	5	4	3	2	1
78	Type size and style	5	4	3	2	1
79	Durability of binding	5	4	3	2	1
80	Neatness and general printing quality	5	4	3	2	1

24

Disregard the small numbers in the margins and under the blanks. They will be used by the data processors.

33